REMARKS

Claims 5, 8-10, 18, 19, and 23-30 are pending in the application. Claims 5, 18, 23, 24, 26, and 30 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found in Applicant's disclosure as published in United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0102500, specifically at paragraphs [0010], [0021], [0022], and [0027]; and in Figures 1 and 2. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office Action objected to claims 5, 8, 9, 18, 23, and 26 for minor formal issues. Therefore, the claims have been amended to provide antecedent and correct dependency.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejected claims 5, 8-10, 18-19, and 23-30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lerner (US 6,954,799 B2) in view of Cocotis et al. (US Pub 2003/007896500) in view of Ims (Pub No. 2002/0091533).

Claim 5 has been amended to specify that the encryption of the MQ message is done by an encryption engine integrated into the agent device. Independent claim 23 has been similarly amended. Support for the amendment is found at paragraph [0019] of Applicant's specification as published in Pub. No. 2005/01022500 A1. This claimed feature is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

Claims 8-10 are dependent on claim 5 and are therefore not unpatentable over the

cited references for at least the same reasons that claim 5 is not unpatentable over the cited references.

Claim 18 has been amended similarly to claim 5 and therefore is not rendered obvious by the cited prior art. Claim 18 has been amended to require "relaying the MQ message to a first queue manager for decoding the encrypted MQ message." Support for this amendment is found at paragraph [0022] of Applicant's specification as published in Pub. NO. 2005/0102500A1. Claim 19 is dependent on claim 18 and is therefore not unpatentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that claim 18 is not unpatentable over the cited references. None of the cited references teach or suggest this limitation. Claim 19 is dependent on claim 18 and thus includes the limitation described herein and is patentable over the cited references for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claim 23 has been amended to specify "an encryption engine integrated into an agent device for encrypting the MQ message using Hyper-Text Transport Protocol Secure (HTTPS) to provide an encrypted MQ message." This limitation is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references. Claims 24-30 are dependent on claim 23 and are therefore not unpatentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that claim 23 is not unpatentable over the cited references.

Claim 23 is a system counterpart to claim 5 and contains the same limitations that are not found in the cited references; therefore claim 23 and its dependent claims 24 and 25 are not unpatentable over the cited references.

Claim 26 is a counterpart to claim 5 and contains the same limitations that are not

found in Arnone and Grovit; therefore claim 26 and its dependent claims 27-30 are not

unpatentable over the cited references.

<div align="center">

CONCLUSION

</div>

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending

claims. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, including

any petition for extension of time fees under §1.17, to Deposit Account Number 09-0460.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Buchenhorner/

Michael J. Buchenhorner
Reg. No. 33,162

E-filed on Date: March 1, 2010

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.
8540 S.W. 83 Street
Miami, Florida 33143
(305) 273-8007 (voice)
(305) 595-9579 (fax)